

Statement of Dr. Luther L. Terry Surgeon General, Public Health Service. Senate Hearings 1965.

34

CIGARETTE LABELING AND ADVERTISING

CIGARETTE LABELING

Each of the bills would require warning labels and the wording of these labels is specified in the bills. It seems preferable to leave formulation of the precise warning required to administrative regulation. This would allow for changes through research or technical improvements which might, in the course of time, result in a safer cigarette. Such changes might justify a reduced warning or perhaps even its omission. It is possible that other statements on the package, or in other labeling, or in advertising might serve to negate such a warning, however subtly. We would further suggest that specific authority be included to prohibit or regulate the use of statements that either negate the warning or, while not clearly doing so and at least not demonstrably false, might give the consumer the misleading impression that a given cigarette is safer than others.

Both bills provide for a statement as to contents. S. 547 would require that each package bear a statement as to the content of each "incriminated agent" found in cigarette smoke and S. 559 would require a statement as to the average tar and nicotine yield as measured by a specified method. At one time, the use of such claims caused widespread confusion as to the possible healthfulness of one cigarette as opposed to another. While it seems at least plausible that cigarettes with lower tar and nicotine may present lesser health hazards, there is presently no proof that this is so. There is some evidence that symptoms associated with certain diseases are less common in those who use the lower nicotine, lower tar cigarettes, and further research may disclose other agents, or specific tar components, that may be related to the incidence of serious diseases. But it is exceedingly important that the consumer be warned that while such a cigarette may be safer, it is not safe.

Any statement as to contents should, in our view, be based upon a standardized determination in accordance with regulations, and should be utilized to present meaningful information to the consumer—information which will allow him or her to make an intelligent choice. We would recommend that, instead of setting forth in the statute particular components of tobacco smoke that must be disclosed on the label and the method of determining such components quantitatively, regulatory authority be provided to decide which particular components of cigarette smoke should be disclosed on the label. This authority should also extend to the analytical methods to be used, and the manner in which the information is presented to the consumer. We would further recommend that the regulatory agency be authorized to require the manufacturers to provide the agency with information as to the ingredients—including additives—of cigarette tobacco.

Lastly, I should like to touch briefly on the question of the agency or agencies in which these functions should be vested. It is clear, in view of what I have already said, that it would oversimplify the matter, in our opinion, to attempt to spell out the requirements in the statute itself and dispense altogether with regulatory administration. With regard to labeling regulations of cigarettes, the Department has concluded, on balance, that responsibility should be vested in our Department, preferably by way of appropriate amendments to the Federal Hazardous Labeling Act of which, Mr. Chairman, you are the author. This conclusion was reached after consideration of the

of regulatory approach required enforcement provisions which would and relevant experience under the Federal Hazardous Labeling Act. The Cosmetic Act further commands that regulation of cigarette regulation is needed, should be made by the Federal Trade Commission. It is our belief that passage of significant value in control of cigarette smoking and in our efforts to make useful and meaningful individual decisions can be made. Our belief is based, in part, on an opinion conducted during the number of questions were asked to ascertain general and specific ideas leading of "appropriate remedies." Preliminary figures from this should like to share some of the 77.7 percent of the people ask cigarette smoking is enough of a health. 7.5 percent of the people ask the general public knows all it and health.

60.4 percent of the people phrased statement— cigarette manufacturers should not a warning label like, "cigarette" By the way, 62.4 percent of the version of that statement. The statement is pre-entitled, perhaps the public's feeling is quite a warning label.

The same kind of negative statement:

Cigarette advertising or commercial statement to the effect that smoking

Here again, a large majority disagreed with that 67.3 percent agreed with that

This indicates again that phrased the public is in favor of advertising.

The consensus grows even stronger on this statement:

Cigarette companies should put on their cigarette packages a statement of tar and nicotine in their cigarettes. 79.1 percent of the people

1005072762

Statement of Dr. Luther L. Terry, Surgeon General, Public Health Service, House of Representatives Hearings, 1965.

114

CIGARETTE LABELING AND ADVERTISING—1965

labeling, or in advertising do not in any way serve to negate such a warning, however subtly. We would suggest that specific authority be included to prohibit use of statements that either negate the warning or, while not clearly doing so and at least not demonstrably false, might give the consumer the misleading impression that a given cigarette is less hazardous than it actually is or less of a risk than others.

We are also concerned about the fact that three of these bills (H.R. 3014, H.R. 4007, and H.R. 7051), would forbid any requirement, including any FTC requirements, for inclusion of a health message in advertising for cigarettes that are labeled as required by the bills. Whether the effect of a label warning can be adequate in itself, and whether it is likely to be neutralized or overcome by the effect of advertising, are questions, that, we believe, can best be resolved on the basis of actual experience.

The Federal Trade Commission, in its trade regulation rule, has specifically invited interested parties to apply for suspension, modification, or abrogation of its rule with respect to advertising of cigarettes before its effective date if circumstances have sufficiently changed. This could include consideration of the effect of a label warning. We do not believe that the public health would be well served by striking from the hands of the Commission the authority over advertising that it asserts.

One of the bills, H.R. 4244, requires a statement of tar and nicotine content on the cigarette package. At one time the use of tar and nicotine content claims, based on a variety of measurement methods, caused widespread confusion as to the possible healthfulness of one cigarette as opposed to another. However, there now is a standardized method of measuring tar and nicotine yield which can be duplicated. Although we cannot definitely prove that a reduction of tar and nicotine content in cigarette smoke will significantly decrease the health hazard, it is a reasonable assumption that this would result. There is evidence that symptoms associated with certain diseases are less common in those who use the lower nicotine, lower tar cigarettes. But it is exceedingly important that the consumer be informed that while such cigarettes may be less hazardous, they are not safe. Many smokers, as I have said, find it difficult to stop smoking, but the substantial switch to filter cigarettes indicates they are anxious to protect their health by smoking what they believe to be a less hazardous product. For these several reasons, we feel that a statement on the package of tar and nicotine content based on a standardized determination would be useful.

However, current research concerning the various components of cigarette smoke may call for changes in the tar and nicotine statement or indicate other components that should be listed on the cigarette package. We would recommend that instead of a specific statutory requirement for a statement as to particular components of cigarette smoke, regulatory authority be provided to decide which particular components should be disclosed on the label. This flexibility of authority should also extend to the analytical methods to be used and the manner in which the information is presented to the consumer. Any statement as to contents should, in our view, be based upon a standardized determination and should be utilized to present meaningful

CIGARETTE LABELING AND

information to the consumer. We would like to see a regulatory agency be authorized to provide the agency with continuing information on including additives, in cigarettes, H.R. 3014, H.R. 4007, and H.R. 7051, "any roll of tobacco or other substance other than tobacco, and intended to "other substance" may be aimed: there is almost no information as to regard comparable to the information intended sense of the word.

Lastly, I should like to touch briefly on the functions of these agencies in which these functions are of what I have already said, that it is our opinion, to attempt to spell out itself and dispense altogether with regard to the labeling of cigarette cluded, on balance, that responsibility, preferably by way of appropriate Hazardous Substances Labeling after consideration of the type of the inspection, seizure, and other then be automatically available. experience built up in the Administered Substances Labeling Act and the further commends this approach. Advertising, on the other hand, should be left to the Federal Trade Commission as I.

Mr. Chairman, the Public Health problem of smoking and health in a very limited way, to include the following four areas:

(1) disseminating information on the health hazards of cigarette smoking; (2) determining effective ways for people who want to stop cigarette smoking;

(3) exploring techniques for helping people and their teachers a smoking;

(4) studying the social factors which determine smoking and attitudes toward smoking.

As you may know, more than 50% of the report have been prepared by the American Cancer Society, the American Heart Association, and the American Lung Association. In addition, five states have been involved in the study of children's reactions to a smoking ban. In Pennsylvania, we are studying the effects of a smoking ban on children. In Arizona, we are studying the effects of a smoking ban on children. In California, we are studying the effects of a smoking ban on children. In New York, we are studying the effects of a smoking ban on children. In Massachusetts, we are studying the effects of a smoking ban on children.

1005072763